| 1 | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 8 | * * * | |
| 9 | RICHARD L. MITCHELL, | Case No. 2:18-cv-00646-RFB-EJY |
| 0 | Plaintiff, | OPPER |
| 1 | v. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 3 | LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al., | |
| 4 | Defendants. | |
| 5 | | |

Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 23] of the Honorable Elayna J. Youchah, United States Magistrate Judge, entered March 3, 2021.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct "any review," de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due

by March 17, 2021. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 23] is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's claims against the State of Nevada, claims for money damages against LVMPD Officers Stephen and Garcia in their official capacities is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's claims against the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Fourth Amendment excessive force claim against LVMPD Officer Stephen, and Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claims against LVMPD Officers Stephen and Garcia in their individual capacities is DISMISSED without prejudice, with leave to amend.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff is given one, and only one, final opportunity to file a second amended complaint correcting the above deficiencies within thirty (30) court days from the date this Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted, with the following admonishment: Plaintiff is advised that if he files a second amended complaint, his Amended Complaint no longer serves any function in this case. As such, the second amended complaint must be complete in and of itself without reference to prior pleadings or other documents. The Court cannot refer to a prior pleading or other documents to make Plaintiff's second amended complaint complete.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff fails to comply with this recommendation's the Court will dismiss this case with prejudice.

DATED: May 11, 2021.

RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II United States District Judge